



Kernos

Revue internationale et pluridisciplinaire de religion
grecque antique

4 | 1991
Varia

Herodotos, I, 78 and 84 : Which Telmessos ?

David Harvey



Electronic version

URL: <http://journals.openedition.org/kernos/304>

DOI: 10.4000/kernos.304

ISSN: 2034-7871

Publisher

Centre international d'étude de la religion grecque antique

Printed version

Date of publication: 1 January 1991

Number of pages: 245-258

ISSN: 0776-3824

Electronic reference

David Harvey, « Herodotos, I, 78 and 84 : Which Telmessos ? », *Kernos* [Online], 4 | 1991, Online since 11 March 2011, connection on 01 May 2019. URL : <http://journals.openedition.org/kernos/304> ; DOI : 10.4000/kernos.304

HERODOTOS, I, 78 AND 84 : WHICH TELMESSOS ?*

Dedicated to the memory of Alan Hall

Strange things sometimes happened at Sardis, if we are to believe Herodotos. Shortly before the city was besieged by Cyrus in the 540s, the suburbs swarmed with snakes. The horses promptly left their usual grazing-grounds, and ate them up (I, 78). At an earlier date, not specified by Herodotos, but before the VIIth century¹, King Mēlēs' concubine had given birth to a lion (I, 84, 3). In both cases, the men of Telmessos² were consulted : Croesus sent messengers (*theopropoi*) to Telmessos to discover the meaning of the portent, but by the time that they returned to Sardis, the city had fallen; Mēlēs was advised by the Telmessians to carry his beastly son around the wall of the akropolis at Sardis, in order to make it impregnable.

I am not concerned here with the plausibility of these stories³, but with a less interesting question. There are two places called Telmessos : one in Karia, 60 stades (8 or 9 km) west of Halikarnassos, modern Gürice⁴, which we will call TK; and another on the western coast of

* Works listed in the Bibliography are referred to by author's name only.

¹ Gyges succeeded Kandaules c. 680 B.C.; the names of Kandaules' predecessors (other than Agron) are not given by HERODOTOS (I, 7), but we must assume that Mēlēs was amongst them – though he may be an entirely mythological character. HERODOTOS writes at I, 84 as if the reader will know who this king is, although he has not mentioned him before. Clearly chs. 7 and 84 were written independently of each other.

² This is how HERODOTOS spells it; Telmissos and Telemessos are also found : RUGE, col. 409, 410-411.

³ On ch. 78, I have been informed by experienced members of the British Horse Society both that it is possible that horses might eat snakes, if they were short of protein and the snakes were small and non-poisonous, and that it is impossible, since their teeth are not adapted to them. On ch. 84, see Stephanie WEST, *Sham Shahs*, to be published in a forthcoming *Festschrift* for G.L. CAWKWELL; on giving birth to lions, cf. HERODOTOS, VI, 131, 2, with F.D. HARVEY in *Historia*, 15 (1966), p. 255.

⁴ The fundamental discussion is BEAN & COOK, p. 153-1555; earlier writers, following PATON & MYRES, put it at Pelen. For an excellent map, see *JHS*, 16 (1896), pl. XI (placing Telmessos at Pelen); sketchmap in BEAN, *TBM*¹, p. 115 = *TBM*², p. 91. Gürice is accepted by e.g. OLSHAUSEN, LAUMONIER, p. 611. BEAN,

Lykia, modern Fethiye, which we will call TL. Which is Herodotos talking about ⁵?

*

If we turn to the commentators, we find that Rawlinson dismisses TK, and writes : «The Lexicographers (Photius, *Suidas*, *Etym. Magn.*, &c.) are unanimous in giving the prophetic character to the Lycian city; and when Cicero (*De Div.* i. 41) and Clement of Alexandria (*Strom.* i. p. 100) place the prophetic Telmessus in Caria, it is quite possible that they mean the same city». Unfortunately, Rawlinson's summary of the lexicographers is not quite accurate. Photios, the *Souda* and the *Etym. Magn. s.v.* Τελμισσεῖς all tell us :

οἱτοὶ οἰκοῦσιν ἐν Καρία, ἀπέχοντες ξ' στάδια Ἀλικαρνασσοῦ, ὡς Πολέμων. Τελμισσὸς δὲ πόλις ἐν Λυκία, ἀπὸ Τελμισσοῦ τοῦ Ἀπόλλωνος καὶ μιᾶς τῶν Ἀντήνορος θυγατέρων, ἣ ἐμίγη εἰς σκύλακα μεταβαλὼν, διὸ καὶ τερατοσκόπον αὐτὸν ἐποίησεν· ὡς Διονύσιος ἐν Κτίσεσι.

These people live in Karia, sixty stades away from Halikarnassos, according to Polemo [of Ilion : early 1st c. B.C.]. Telmissos is also a *polis* in Lykia, originating from Telmissos the son of Apollo and one of the daughters of Antenor, with whom he had intercourse in the form of a dog; therefore [!] he [presumably Apollo] made him an observer of prodigies [*teratoskopos*], according to Dionysios [of Khalkis] in his *Ktiseis*.

So the founder of TL observed (and presumably interpreted) prodigies : he might have done so at the time of its foundation, but that is no reason to suppose that the city had a «prophetic character». It may have done, though the lexica do not say so⁶. Furthermore, these texts do not entitle us

*TBM*¹, p. 122 = ² p. 122 reckons it is some 11. 3 km from Halikarnassos. He probably walked it, while the others calculated it from maps.

⁵ Scholars in favour of TL include all commentators on HERODOTOS, RUGE and FONTENROSE; in favour of TK, DAUX, LAUMONIER, BEAN (*TBM* and *LT*) and PARKE; whereas GÖBER, the authors of *ATL*, BEAN & COOK, NILSSON and BRYCE leave the question open. BRYCE, p. 199, writes : «Very likely the Greco-Roman authors were often unclear as to which of the two cities specific responses ought to be attributed (to)»; maybe, but this cannot apply to HERODOTOS, who was born and brought up only a few miles from TK.

⁶ A founding hero may, or may not, pass on his mantic powers to the community that he establishes (cf. BRELICH, p. 106-113, 141-151). On Lycian oracles in general, see L.R. FARNELL, *The Cults of the Greek States*, IV, Oxford, 1907, p. 229-231, with testimonia on p. 406-407; BRYCE, p. 193-202.

to conclude *e silentio* that TK was not a centre of mantic activity. Indeed, their information about TK is minimal : perhaps the excerptors were eager to get on to the picturesque story of the randy dog (omitted by the *Etym. Magn.*)⁷.

Rawlinson then forces Cicero into agreement with his skewed interpretation of the lexicographers, on no better grounds than that TL «was so near the confines of Caria as to be sometimes assigned to that country». This is no argument at all : yet nearly all subsequent commentators have simply parroted him. Sayce writes «probably the Lykian Telmessos», giving no reasons; Stein, clearly dependent on Rawlinson, asserts «*die letzte [TL] ist hier gemeint*» (not even *wahrscheinlich*); How and Wells, equally dependent on Rawlinson, conclude, without argument, that «probably the last [TL] is here meant» (= Stein, word-order and all); and Sheets assigns the stories «probably» to TL. This hardly reflects much credit on the commentators : they have simply copied one another, and no progress has been made since the 1850s - rather the reverse, since Rawlinson at least stated his reasons, inadequate though they were. The honourable exception is Legrand, who leaves the question open⁸.

*

For further enlightenment one turns to Ruge's article in *RE*. One does not receive it. What Ruge has to say about Herodotos has to be taken in the context of his whole discussion of the two Telmessoi (col. 413-415), which is a textbook example of bad historical method. Since Ruge is always cited with respect, even by those who dissent from him, his arguments deserve careful examination.

First he states that some coins of TL show Apollo, which proves «beyond a shadow of doubt» (*unzweideutig*) that prophecy (*Mantik*) was practised there. Surely not⁹. Then he collects all the *late* evidence, none

⁷ See further p. 222. APOSTOLIOS, XVI, 24 (*Paræm. Gr.*, II, p. 663 LEUTSCH) is rightly dismissed as a *plume sans autorité* by DAUX, p. 12 n. 1, but duly cited by RUGE, col. 413. Writing in the XVth century (see *RE* II, col. 182-183), APOSTOLIOS simply copies the earlier lexicographers, but carelessly writes that TK was one stade from Halikarnassos instead of sixty, and that in order to have sex, Telmissos changed, not into a dog (σκύλακα), but a drinking-cup (κύλικα). The mind boggles.

⁸ I have not seen the recent commentary on HERODOTOS I by D. ASHERI, Verona, 1988.

⁹ See e.g. C.M. KRAAY, *Greek Coins*, London, 1966, p. 391-392.

of it earlier than Tatian (IInd c. A.D.), which in his view shows that there was an oracle at TL.

The whole of his argument, in fact, hangs on his interpretation of Tatian (who lived eight centuries after Croesus). He writes (col. 413) : «Tatian. *ad Graecos*, I stellt den traumdeutenden Telmessiern die Karer gegenüber, die τὴν διὰ τῶν ἄστρον πρόγνωσιν üben; also sind seine Telmessier keine Karer, sondern müssen Lykier sein» : «Tatian, *ad Graecos* 1 [Migne, PG, VI, col. 804] contrasts the Telmessian dream-interpreters with the Karians who practise astrology; his Telmessians are therefore not Karians, but must be Lykians». But this is a misinterpretation. Tatian is arguing that the Greeks acquired all their arts from «barbarians» : his first example is :

Τελμισσέων μὲν γὰρ οἱ δοκιμώτατοι τὴν δι' ὀνείρων ἐξεῦρον μαντικὴν·
Κἄρες τὴν διὰ τῶν ἄστρον πρόγνωσιν·

the most distinguished among the Telmessians invented prophecy from dreams, the Karians invented astrology ...

These are the first two items in a *list*, which continues with Phrygians, Isaurians, Cypriots and so forth : hence the lack of connectives. The list begins (a) distinguished Telmessians, (b) Karians in general¹⁰; and the former are *not*, as Ruge asserts, contrasted with the latter¹¹. Clement of Alexandria (*Strom.*, I, 16, 74, 3-5) follows Tatian very closely, and Eusebios (*Praep. evang.*, X, 6) is taken *verbatim* from Clement; they are not independent witnesses, as the innocent reader of Ruge might think¹².

Having made this false distinction, Ruge proceeds to assign a number of late testimonia to TL on the basis of it; and then all the earlier evidence is simply forced to fit the Lykian site. The method is basically still that of Rawlinson, but Ruge collects more evidence, adds further arguments, carries them further, and adopts a more dogmatic tone. None of this justifies his deduction that whenever an earlier author mentions a Telmessos, and we do not know which of the two he meant –

¹⁰ We may, however, wonder whether TATIAN had the foggiest idea where the Telmessians lived : his home was east of the Tigris.

¹¹ This paragraph completes the task left unfinished by BEAN & COOK, p. 153 : «We cannot enter here into the details», etc.

¹² These lists belong to the tradition of the catalogue of inventors best exemplified by PLINY, *NH*, VII, 56, 191-209. See generally A. KLEINGÜNTHER, *Πρώτος Εύρέτης*, Leipzig, 1933 (p. 143-151 for origins).

for example, Aristophanes, in his *Telmesseis* (fr. 528-540 K = 543-555 Kassel-Austin) – then it must be TL.

Still less does it justify dismissing as a confusion the evidence of Cicero, who could hardly be more explicit in placing divination at TK : *Telmessus in Caria est, qua in urbe excellit haruspicum disciplina* (*De div.*, I, 41, 91), and again, *tum Caria tota praecipueque Telmesses... in ostentis animadvertentis diligentes fuerunt* (42, 94). Cicero speaks of the exceptional fertility of the fields cultivated by the Telmessians (*ib.*), and Ruge says that this is totally inconsistent (*passt absolut nicht*) with TK, whereas at TL there are wide plains to the east. But if Cicero is confused about the fertile plains¹³, it does not follow that he is mistaken about where the *haruspices* lived. Furthermore, he refers not to the extent of the agricultural land, but to its fertility, and TK did in fact control a small plain around Musgebi (Episkopi, now renamed Ortakent : see reff. in n.4)¹⁴.

It is no surprise, then, to find that Ruge (col. 414) places Herodotos' Telmessos at TL. He gives two reasons : (a) it suits Herodotos' narrative better, because it is further from Sardis than TK; (b) Herodotos' word «sail» (ἀναπλώσαι, I, 78, 2) implies a port rather than a sanctuary in the mountains.

Neither argument has any value. (a) As for the distance : Croesus arrived back at Sardis after the indecisive battle at Pterie (Herodotos, I, 76-77) with Cyrus hot on his heels (αὐτίκα, ὡς δύναται τάχιστα, κατὰ τάχος, 79, 1-2), and Cyrus captured the city after a siege of fourteen days (84, 1; 86, 1). The snakes made their appearance between the return of Croesus and the arrival of Cyrus, and the *theopropoi* were sent immediately (αὐτίκα, 78, 2) to Telmessos. Two routes were available to them. They could have travelled overland – and therefore slowly – to Ephesos and then sailed south; or down the Hermos to Smyrna, and south from that port. They appear to have chosen the latter route, although it will have entailed a long detour around the Erythrai peninsula : Herodotos

¹³ LAUMONIER, p. 613-614, follows RUGE in maintaining that CICERO is confused; *contra*, BEAN & COOK, p. 153. For real confusion see BRYCE, p. 201 n. 51, who states that CICERO refers to *Lycii augures* in this passage (*De div.*, I, 41, 91); he does so at I, 15, 25, but that passage has nothing to do with Telmessos.

¹⁴ RUGE, col. 414, admits that the story of Gordios (ARRIAN, *Anab.*, II, 3, 3-4) suits both sites, and decides that the names Telmessos has been wrongly introduced into it at a late stage. Whether this is true or not, the question still remains : which Telmessos ? The verb ἐξηγγείσθαι and the eagle point clearly to TK (see p. 252-253), and BEAN & COOK, p. 153, rightly refer the anecdote to that site. See also n. 20.

uses the word ἀναπλῶσαι of their return journey, which should mean «to sail upstream»¹⁵ – i.e. up the Hermos. This works out (*very* approximately) at some 120 km by river and 400 by sea¹⁶. They must have stopped to eat, and to sleep. If we may judge by later evidence, official delegations often moved at a leisurely pace¹⁷. We may assume that envoys from the great king of Lydia will have been treated with lavish hospitality *en route* and at their destination. Then we must add on the return journey. If we suppose that the *theopropoi* were despatched, say, six days before the arrival of Cyrus, and that Herodotos' figure of fourteen days for the siege is accurate¹⁸, that gives them twenty days plus for their journey and consultation, which is surely not too long. Thus TK is compatible with Herodotos' story as TL.

(b) Ruge's second argument (accepted by Bryce, p. 201), that TL is a port, and TK is not, is very easily disposed of. TK is indeed inland, but by far the best way to reach it is by sea. Visitors would have put in at Halikarnassos, and travelled the nine km to TK by land. (It seems less likely that an official group would have sailed 3 km up the little stream, now the Uludere, which leads directly to Telmessos). Ruge appears to imply that those who came to TK normally travelled by land, which is most improbable¹⁹.

¹⁵ See LSJ s.v. – J.E. POWELL, *A Lexicon to Herodotus*, Cambridge, 1938, s.v., distinguishes ἀναπλέω (1), «sail upstream» from ἀναπλέω (2) «sail, swim back», and lists I, 78, 2 under (2), together with II, 93, 2, 3, 4. But in all these passages the sense of «back» is conveyed by ὀπίσω, and the three instances in II, 93 clearly mean «swim upstream» as opposed to ἐξ θάλασσαν.

¹⁶ The other route (again, *very* approximately : my figures are calculated by map and ruler) is some 130 km by land plus 140 by sea. No doubt the longer way was chosen because of the difficulties and dangers of land travel, especially in mountainous terrain : cf. L. CASSON, *Travel in the Ancient World*, London, 1974, p. 67-74.

¹⁷ E.g. DEMOSTHENES, XIX, 58-60; ARISTOPHANES, *Acharnians*, 65-90, 136-137 (comic exaggeration, but the jokes would be pointless if there were no justification for them); cf. D.J. MOSLEY, *Envoys and Diplomacy in Ancient Greece*, Wiesbaden, 1973, p. 68-73.

¹⁸ The figure fourteen may not be historical : it is perhaps suspicious that Croesus reigned fourteen years (I, 86, 1), and fourteen boys were put on the pyre with him (86, 2); but such a low figure is not likely to have been invented if the siege had been remembered as a lengthy one.

¹⁹ Before the construction of the modern highway, travel by land between Sardis and TK would have been rough and dangerous going. The modern road crosses the wide plain of the Maeander, and then continues west and south of the Bafa Gölü. This route did not exist in antiquity : the Maeander had not silted up to such an extent, and the Bafa Gölü was an arm of the sea, so that the

Ruge's arguments, then, are quite valueless, although they have been very influential²⁰, no doubt because of the prestige of Pauly. It would appear to be necessary to make a fresh start.

*

In fact, a fresh start has already been made. The correct solution was briefly stated by Georges Daux half a century ago, in an article which seems to have escaped the notice of most subsequent investigators²¹.

Daux's main thesis does not answer our question, though it provides an important clue, and it certainly clarifies and illuminates Herodotos' narrative. He shows that there was no oracle at TK. The oracle mentioned in *SIG*³, 1044 is not at TK (Daux, p. 14-17²²), and the various stories about the place make it quite clear that we are dealing, not with an oracle (as previous scholars had assumed, and as most continue to assume²³), but with *exegetai*, «interpreters» or «expounders» – a very different matter. An oracle gives advice, or foretells what is to come²⁴, whereas an exegete interprets divine signs and portents. An oracle is

ancient traveller would have been forced to traverse rugged, mountainous territory, ideal for brigands. Cf. n. 16.

- 20 Most recently, for example, FONTENROSE, p. 78, puts the stories of Gordios (ARRIAN, *Anab.*, II, 3, 2-4) and of Croesus at TL, without even indicating that any other possibility exists (FONTENROSE's «Telmessoï» should be corrected to Telmesseis throughout).
- 21 It was overlooked by BEAN & COOK, by BEAN in his more recent books, by BRYCE, OLSHAUSEN, and FONTENROSE. Only LAUMONIER, p. 612 with n. 3 and 4, and PARKE, p. 255 n. 27, cite it, with approval.
- 22 DAUX, p. 14-17. Two inscriptions mention TK : the will of Poseidonios, *SIG*³, 1044, c. 300 B.C., and the decree in honour of Posideos son of Posideos, *JHS*, 14 (1894), p. 377-378, early IInd c. B.C. Posideos is a member of the prophetic *genos* (line 3 : see n. 25); we might guess that Poseidonios belonged to the same family; after all, TK was a small community : the inhabitants lived in *komai*, not a *polis* (ARRIAN, *Anab.*, II, 3, 4), a term which the lexica use of TL, but not of TK; cf. HICKS, p. 379. However, Poseidonios may have been a common local name : there was a temple of Poseidon at Halikarnassos, and Poseidonioi too (e.g. *SIG*³, 46. 28, 57 [Vth c. B.C.]; 1020 A15 [Ist c. B.C.]).
- 23 Before DAUX : PATON & MYRES, p. 375; RUGE, col. 410, 413. After : BEAN & COOK, p. 152, 154 with n. 283; NILSSON, p. 546; A.H.M. JONES, *Cities of the Eastern Roman Provinces*, Oxford, 1971², p. 32; OLSHAUSEN.
- 24 R. PARKER in P.A. CARTLEDGE & F.D. HARVEY (edd.), *Crux : essays presented to G.E.M. de Ste. Croix on his 75th birthday*, Exeter & London, 1985, p. 298-326, esp. 298-304. Note the sharp distinction between seers and oracles in W. BURKERT, *Greek Religion*, Oxford, 1985, p. 111-118.

normally attached to a temple, but exegetes are independent officials who live in their own private houses, just like secular magistrates. They were not priests, and they had no «place of office»²⁵. It is perhaps dangerous to quote so late an author as Nonnos Abbas in this context : he wrote in the sixth century A.D.²⁶, and starts badly by locating Telmessos in Pamphylia, but (whatever his source) he gets the rest exactly right :

αὕτη δὲ παλαιότατη πόλις· ἦν δὲ καὶ ἐπὶ χρόνων τοῦ Κροίσου. Οὗτοι λέγονται πρῶτοι τοὺς ὀνείρους εὐρεῖν, καὶ διακρίνειν τὰ τέρατα. Ἐλεγον γὰρ, εἰ γέγονέ τι παράδοξον, ὅτι τόδε σημαίνει, καὶ πάντως ὡς ἂν εἶπον συνέβαινεν ἐξέρχεσθαι.

(*ad Gregorii Orat. I contra Julianum*, 71 = Migne, PG, XXXVI, col. 1021)

It is a very ancient city; it existed even in the time of Croesus. These people are said... to have interpreted prodigies. For if anything unusual happened, they used to say what it meant, and it always turned out as they said.

Herodotos (I, 78, 2) speaks of exegetes, not of an oracle, and they do precisely what exegetes always do : they explain (I, 78) and give advice on (I, 84) unnatural occurrences. Similarly in Arrian we find two unnatural ornithological incidents – a swallow persistently twittering on the head of Alexander the Great (*Anab.*, I., 25, 6-8), and a eagle

²⁵ FONTENROSE (p. 78) aptly contrasts the Branchidai : the Telmessians «apparently remained just a group of independent practitioners, any one of whom could be consulted, whereas the Branchidai developed an Oracle, an establishment with a fixed mantic procedure and a regular personnel»; but he fails to stress that the Telmessians were exegetes. PARKE in his admirable account comments (p. 185) that at TK «the prophetic cult remained at the elementary stage of interpreting omens instead of progressing towards an organised institution for ascertaining and enunciating the god's will». – The exegetes of Telmessos, unlike those of most ancient states, were internationally famous, and it is therefore just possible that, exceptionally, they had a special sanctuary; but there is no evidence for it. – The best-known exegetes are Athenian : see F. JACOBY, *Atthis*, Oxford, 1949, ch. 1, esp. p. 8-51; on their functions, p. 44-45, 47. J.H. OLIVER, *The Athenian Expounders of the Sacred and Ancestral Law*, Baltimore, 1950, is not helpful in the present context. The JACOBY-OLIVER controversy continues in H. BLOCH, *AJPh*, 74 (1953), p. 407-418, and OLIVER, *AJPh*, 75 (1954), p. 160-174. See also NILSSON, p. 636-637; R. PARKER, *Miasma*, Oxford, 1983, index s.v. Exegetes. BRYCE, p. 200, wrongly speaks of priests.

²⁶ See *RE*, XVII, col. 904 s.v. *Nonnos* 14 for further details. The passage is mistranslated in MIGNE.

persistently perched on Gordios' plough (II, 3, 3) – that require explanation. Alexander was besieging Halikarnassos, and it was Aristandros of Telmessos, a *mantis*, who explained the swallow : as Bean (*LT*, p. 39-40) sees, this is surely a *mantis* from the nearby TK. In the Gordios story, Arrian uses the *mot juste* for exegetes, ἐξηγεῖσθαι : furthermore, we know from Stephanos of Byzantium (s.v. Γαλεῶται) that it was TK with which the eagle was associated²⁷. Cicero (*De div.*, I, 41, 91) speaks of *haruspices*, not of an *oraculum*, and, as we have seen (p. 249), explicitly places Telmessos in Karia. Skill in interpretation was a gift given to an entire *genos* among the Telmessians, men, women and children, according to Arrian (*loc. cit.*); Herodotos (I, 78, 1-2; 84, 3) never refers to any individuals, but always to a group, the Τελμισσέες²⁸. It all hangs together.

Daux's conclusions also throw light on two other questions. (a) There is some doubt about exactly where the temple was at TK (see n. 4). But as there were exegetes, not an oracle, at TK, its position is irrelevant : for, as we have seen, exegetes were not attached to a temple. Topographers such as Paton & Myres, p. 373, 379, Bean & Cook, p. 154, and Bean, *TBM*¹, p. 122 = ² p. 97 have sought the «temple of Telmessian Apollo»; but even if this is what the disputed building was (and even that is not quite certain²⁹), it will have had nothing to do with the consultations of the Telmessians mentioned in our literary texts.

²⁷ On theriomorphic heroes, see BRELICH, p. 278-280.

²⁸ Since HERODOTOS speaks of Τελμισσέες in this way, it is tempting to take ARRIAN, *Anab.*, II, 2, 3 as implying that all the inhabitants could explain prodigies (so BRELICH, p. 152 n. 216). But the weight of the evidence is against it. The inscription *JHS*, 14 (1894), p. 377-378, refers to Apollo as τὸν ἀρχηγέτην τοῦ γένους (line 3); CICERO seems to imply a *genus* (*De div.*, I, 41, 91); ARRIAN speaks of τοῦ μαντικοῦ γένους (*Anab.*, II, 3, 4). The word *genos* is never used in Greek of an entire community. Furthermore, TATIAN (*ad Graecos*, 1) refers to Τελμισσέων οἱ δοκιμώτατοι, not Τελμισσεῖς (the point is lost in his imitators CLEMENT and EUSEBIOS : see p. 248). We can identify two members of the *genos* : Aristandros (ARRIAN, *Anab.*, I, 25, 8), and Posideos (*JHS* inscription); the name of the former, and the prominent role played by the latter, suggest an aristocratic family.

²⁹ There must have been a temple of Apollo *somewhere* at TK (we know there was an altar : p. 254). The place was founded by a son of Apollo (HÖFER; GÖBER); the Telmessians were «given» their skill (ARRIAN, *Anab.*, II, 3, 3), presumably by Apollo; Apollo was the ἀρχηγέτης of the *genos*, n. 27 above; Apollo bears the title Τελεμεσσοῦ μεδέων, *SIG*, III³, 1044, 7-8, 36-37. There is therefore no need to doubt STEPHANOS OF BYZANTIUM (s.v. Γαλεῶται) when he speaks of Apollo's ἱερόν at TK.

(b) According to Herodotos (I, 46-49), Croesus carried out a test of the Greek oracles, to discover which of them told the truth. The list of oracles consulted by Croesus' representatives (*theopropoi* again, 48, 2) has long been regarded as suspect, and rightly so. One argument against its authenticity is that it should have mentioned other oracles in Asia Minor besides Branchidai³⁰. We must be careful not to include TK.

To return to our main problem : Daux (p. 12, n. 1) points out, devastatingly, that there is no evidence whatever for an oracle, or indeed for prophetic activity of any kind, at TL. *SIG*³, 1044, is irrelevant (p. 14-17). A glance at the testimonia, conveniently collected by Bean & Cook (p. 152), will show that Daux is right as far as the classical sources are concerned³¹. Furthermore, as we have seen (p. 248), Tatian and those who copied him say nothing at all about Lykia. We may add that the tomb of the hero Telmessos³², which served as an altar of Apollo, was also at TK. Clement of Alexandria locates the *mantis* Telmessos in Karia (*Strom.*, I, 21, 134, 30, adding that such men are the «thieves and robbers» of Holy Scripture [John, 10, 8]) : and he speaks of the tomb of Telmessos, surely the same man, in *Protr.*, III, 45, 3 (= Arnobius, *Contra gentes*, VI, 6 = Theodoret, *Graec. affect. curat.*, VIII, 30). Stephanos of Byzantium s.v. Γαλεῶται also speaks of Telmessos as erecting an altar in Karia. We have already shown that the lexicographical tradition (including Apostolios, *pace* Daux, p. 12, n. 1 : see n. 7) speaks of a *teratoskopos* as the founder of TL, but that this proves nothing (p. 246). It follows, then, from a combination of the evidence for *exegesis* at TK, and the lack of evidence for TL, that the two stories in Herodotos should be located at TK.

*

³⁰ H.W. PARKE & D.E.W. WORMELL, *The Delphic Oracle*, I, Oxford, 1956, p. 132, 140; H.W. PARKE, *Greek Oracles*, London, 1967, p. 68; these scholars are careful not to mention TK.

³¹ PLINY, *NH*, XXX, 1, 6, however, does not help DAUX's case : he is discussing magic, not exegesis, and he does not specify which Telmessos is the *religiosissima urbs*.

³² He is presumably to be distinguished from the Telmissos who assumed the form of a dog in order to have sex (p. 246) and founded TL (see HÖFER and GÖBER), though we may suspect that the two were originally identical. BRELICH points out (p. 152, n. 216) that the founder of TK was given instructions by Dodona, not Delphi, which suggests that Apollo may have been superimposed on the original cult at a later date.

This common-sense conclusion comes like a breath of fresh air after the tortuous attempts of others to force all the evidence to fit TL. But some may still feel uneasy. The fact that there is no evidence for divination or exegesis at TL does not prove that it was not practised there. The *teratoskopos* tradition (p. 246) might possibly imply as much (see n. 6). Besides, it has been plausibly suggested that TL could have been founded by settlers from TK (Bryce, p. 200). If so, would they not have taken their expository skills with them ? Several scholars have suggested, with more or less confidence, that there might have been exegetes at both places³³. It is at least a possibility, though in view of all the evidence we have considered, a very tenuous one.

Such doubts will be put to rest if we approach the question from another angle. Herodotos speaks of *one* Telmessos, as if there were not two places with the same name, and as if there could be no possibility of confusion. Why should he do that ? Let us consider some possible reasons :

1. Only one place of that name existed at the time he was writing. This is clearly not true of Telmessos : there is VIIIth-century Greek pottery from TL in the museum at Fethiye, and if TL was a colony of TK (above), TK must have been in existence before that. Furthermore, TL is mentioned in the Athenian Tribute List for 446/5 (*ATL*, 9, III, 33) and the assessment list of 425/4 (*A9*, I, 130).

2. Only one place of that name existed at the time to which he was referring. The evidence just cited rules this out for the time of Croesus; the date of Mēlēs is unknown (n. 1), and he may be mythical; but Herodotos is surely referring to the same place in chapters 78 and 84.

3. He knew of only one place of that name. This seems very unlikely. Herodotos must have known of TK, since it is only 8 or 9 km away from Halikarnassos, where he was born and where he spent his childhood and adolescence. As for TL, Herodotos mentions other *poleis* in Lykia, such as Xanthos, Patara and Phaselis (testimonia in Bryce, p. 219-220), and it would be surprising if he had never heard of TL. If, however, by any chance he *had* heard of only one Telmessos, it would surely have been TK, on the doorstep of his home town.

4. He assumed that his audience would have known of only one Telmessos. This argument leads nowhere, since he recited his work in various places. It is almost universally believed that he gave readings

³³ E.g. GÖBER (though he wrongly speaks of oracles) : BEAN & COOK, p. 151-152 («an apparent fact»); NILSSON, p. 546 (oracles again); LAUMONIER, p. 613; OLSHAUSEN; BRYCE, p. 199 («seem to»).

at Athens³⁴ : since TL was a member-state of the Athenian empire (above), it might have been the one that occurred first to the average Athenian. But when Herodotos read his work elsewhere – for example in the West (IV, 99, 5 : at Thourioi ?), or at Olympia³⁵ – there is no way of telling which place (if any) his listeners would have thought of first. When preparing his book for «publication», moreover, Herodotos will not have had the people of any particular Greek state in mind.

5. One place was so familiar to him, and came to mind so naturally, that he forgot the existence of the other, or at least forgot to specify which of the two he meant. At last we have found a relevant and plausible reason, and one of some importance : for the proximity of TK to Halikarnassos makes it by far the more likely candidate.

6. One place was the obvious place to consult. If TL was colonized from TK (p. 255), the older site is likely to have had the greater prestige. Furthermore, TK was within Croesus' kingdom, but the Lydians never conquered Lykia (Herodotos, I, 28). TK is the better candidate on both counts.

Of these six reasons, then, nos. 1 and 2 are inapplicable, and no. 4 leads nowhere. No. 3 points to TK, but is implausible. That leaves nos. 5 and 6, both of which strongly favour TK rather than TL; no. 5 relates to Herodotos' mental processes, no. 6 is a matter of suitability to context. The weight of probabilities therefore supports TK, and strengthens Daux's conclusions. What, if anything, went on at TL we do not know : but Herodotos' exegetes are surely Cicero's *haruspices*, and, as Cicero says, *Telmessus in Caria est, qua in urbe excellit haruspicum disciplina*³⁶.

David HARVEY

Department of Classics
University of Exeter
ENGLAND

³⁴ F. JACOBY in *RE*, Suppl. II (1913), col. 226-229, 232-242. A.J. PODLECKI's ingenious arguments to the contrary (*Herodotos in Athens ?*, in K.H. KINZL (ed.), *Greece and the Eastern Mediterranean in Ancient History and Prehistory*, Berlin & New York, 1977, p. 246-265) have failed to win general acceptance.

³⁵ So PODLECKI (*op. cit.* [n. 34], p. 251-252), reasonably enough.

³⁶ I am grateful to Dr. Richard Seaford for a number of helpful comments.

TESTIMONIA :

The following texts are relevant to the problems discussed in this article; the list does not include all references to the Telmessoi.

Inscriptions : *ATL*, 9, III, 33; *A9*, I, 130 (TL); *SIG*³, 1044; *JHS*, 14 (1894), p. 377-378 (TK).

Classical authors : HERODOTOS, I, 78; 84, 3; ARISTOPHANES, fr. 528-40 K = 543-55 Kassel-Austin; POLEMO OF ILION ap. PHOTIOS etc. (see below) *s.v.* Τελμισσεῖς; CICERO, *De div.*, I, 41, 91; 42, 94; PLINY, *NH*, XXX, 1, 6; ARRIAN, *Anab.*, I, 25, 6-8; II, 3, 2-4.

Early Christian authors : TATIAN, *adv. Graecos*, 1 = CLEMENT, *Strom.*, I, 16, 74, 3-5 = EUSEBIOS, *Praep. evang.*, X, 6; TERTULLIAN, *De anima*, 46; GREG. NAZ., *Orat. IV : contra Julianum* I, 109; NONNUS ABBAS, *Ad Gregorii Orat. I contra Jul.*, 71 (MIGNE, PG, XXXVI, col. 1021).

Lexica, etc. : PHOTIOS = *Souda* = *Etym. Magn.* = APOSTOLIOS, XVI, 24 (LEUTSCH, *Corpus Paræm. Gr.*, II, p. 663-664 [garbled]), *s.v.* Τελμισσεῖς; schol. in CLEMENT, *Protrep.*, III, 45, 2 (MIGNE, PG, IX, col. 785).

For references to the hero Telmessos, see p. 246-247.

BIBLIOGRAPHY :

The more substantial treatments are marked with an asterisk.

G.E. BEAN, *Turkey Beyond the Maeander*, London, 1971¹, p. 115, 122-123; reprinted without changes in 1980², p. 91, 97-98 = BEAN, *TBM*.

G.E. BEAN, *Lycian Turkey*, London, 1978, p. 9-40 = BEAN, *LT*.

*G.E. BEAN & J.M. COOK, *The Halicarnassus Peninsula*, in *ABSA*, 50 (1955), p. 151-155.

A. BRELICH, *Gli eroi greci*, Rome, 1958, p. 152, esp. n. 216; 278-280; cf. 106-113, 141-151.

T.R. BRYCE, *The Lycians*, I, Copenhagen, 1986, p. 199-202, 240-241.

*G. DAUX, *Y a-t-il un oracle à Telmessos de Carie ?*, in *RPh*, 15 (1941), p. 11-17.

J. FONTENROSE, *Didyma : Apollo's Oracle, Cult and Companions*, Berkeley etc., 1988, p. 78.

W. GÖBER, in *RE*, V A 1, Stuttgart, 1934, col. 416, *s.v.* Telmissos.

E.L. HICKS : see PATON & MYRES.

O. HÖFER in W. ROSCHER, *Lexikon der Mythologie*, V, Leipzig, 1916-1924, col. 346.

W.W. HOW & J. WELLS, *A Commentary on Herodotus* I, Oxford, 1912, p. 95.

A. LAUMONIER, *Les cultes indigènes de la Carie*, Paris, 1958, p. 610-614.

Ph.-E. LEGRAND, *Hérodote : Histoires* I, Paris, 1932 (corrected reprint, 1970), p. 80.

B.D. MERITT, H.T. WADE-GERY & M.F. MCGREGOR, *The Athenian Tribute Lists*, I, Princeton, 1939, p. 554.

M.P. NILSSON, *Geschichte der griechischen Religion*, I, Munich, 1967³, p. 546.

E. OLSHAUSEN, in *Der Kleine Pauly*, V, Munich, 1975, p. 575.

H.W. PARKE, *The Oracles of Apollo in Asia Minor*, Beckenham, 1985, p. 184-185.

*W.R. PATON, J.L. MYRES, & E.L. HICKS, *Three Carian sites*, in *JHS*, 14 (1894), p. 373-380.

G. RAWLINSON, *History of Herodotus I*, London, 1858 & subsequent editions; the revised edition of 1862 has been cited here.

* W. RUGE, in *RE*, V A 1, Stuttgart, 1934, s.v. *Telmessos*, col. 409-415.

A.H. SAYCE, *Herodotos : Books I-III*, London, 1883, p. 46.

G.A. SHEETS, *Herodotus Book I*, Bryn Mawr, 1981, p. 38.

H. STEIN, *Herodotos I*, Berlin, 1883⁵, p. 96.